

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Non-Final Office Action of February 18, 2010 (Office Action). Claims 1, 3, and 18 have been amended. The amendments to these claims are supported by the specification and drawings (see, for example, page 14, lines 14-17; page 29, lines 13-15; and page 33, lines 9-20 of the specification, as well as Figure 3). Therefore, no new matter has been added.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-12, 14, and 16-22 were pending. Claims 1-12, 14, and 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. The rejections, and Applicant's response thereto, are set forth in full below.

The Applicant left a voice mail for the Examiner on July 19, 2010, to discuss the prior art rejections and which summarized the Applicant's position. Applicant's position as articulated in the voice mail is set forth below.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-12, 14, and 17-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,912,564 to Appelman (hereinafter 'Appelman') in view of U.S. Patent Application published under 2002/0087646 to Hickey *et al.* (hereinafter 'Hickey') and further in view of U.S. Patent Application published under 2002/0049806 to Gatz *et al.* (hereinafter 'Gatz').

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Appelman in view of Hickey [*sic*] – (and Gatz), and further in view of 'Official Notice'.

For the following reasons, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

II. Response

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that both email information and instant messaging (IM) information for a particular user is stored in a single database thereby to facilitate integration between email and IM systems and to provide a central repository for both email information and IM information, and that all group email messages from all users are stored in a single email store which is part of the single

database (see, for example, group email store 394 and storage 230 in Figure 3 of the present application). Claims 3 and 18 have been amended in a similar manner.

The Examiner relies on Appelman for teaching an interface for users being able to set their email and instant messaging preferences in subscription profile data. However, Appelman does not teach or suggest that both email and IM information for a particular user is stored in a single database thereby to facilitate integration between email and IM systems and to provide a central repository for both email and IM information, and that all group email messages from all users are stored in a single email store which is part of the single database.

While Hickey discloses an electronic email system 32 having a group electronic mailbox 25yx, Hickey does not disclose that both email and IM information for a particular user is stored in a single database thereby to facilitate integration between email and IM systems and to provide a central repository for both email and IM information, and further that all group email messages from all users are stored in a single email store which is part of the single database. In fact, Hickey is totally silent regarding IM information, let alone facilitating integration between email and IM systems and to provide a central repository for both email and IM information.

Moreover, the Examiner further relies on Gatz for a teaching of access server controls in an account based access server. However, Gatz fails to make up for the deficiencies in Appelman and Hickey. Rather, Gatz only makes a passing reference to IM in connection with a parent modifying a child's instant message ignore lists (see paragraphs [0014] and [0071]).

In contrast, Applicant's amended independent claims recite, in the context of a user IM account, that both email information and IM information for a particular user is stored in a single database thereby to facilitate integration between email and IM systems and to provide a central repository for both email information and IM information, and that all group email messages from all users are stored in a single email store which is part of the single database. Thus, claims 1, 3 and 18 clearly patentably distinguish over the combined teachings of Appelman, Hickey, and Gatz.

With respect to dependent claims, these claims are patentable for the reasons given above regarding their respective independent claims. Moreover, the Examiner is again simply picking and choosing selective teachings from the secondary teachings to somehow arrive at the present invention.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicant requests that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion. Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul F. Neils/
Paul F. Neils, Reg. No. 33,102
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 53844
Telephone: (703) 394-1381